1	Dynament to Dylo 201 of the Endoral Dylog of Evidence, defendant Uniford
1	Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, defendant Unifund
2	CCR Partners hereby requests that this Court take judicial notice of the following
3	documents from the records of the Superior Court of California, County of
4	Stanislaus:
5	1. Complaint in the action entitled <i>Unifund CCR Partners Assignee of</i>
6	Citibank v. Jason E. Davis, Case Number 380735, a certified copy of which is
7	attached hereto as Exhibit A.
8	2. Answer in the action entitled <i>Unifund CCR Partners Assignee of</i>
9	Citibank v. Jason E. Davis, Case Number 380735, a certified copy of which is
10	attached hereto as Exhibit B.
11	
12	DATED: May 1, 2007 SIMMONDS & NARITA, LLP
13	JEFFREY A. TOPOR
14	
15	Dry a/Tomio D. Novito
16	By: <u>s/Tomio B. Narita</u> Tomio B. Narita
17	Attorneys for Defendants Unifund CCR Partners and Steven A. Booska
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Exhibit A

STEVEN A BOOSKA
Attorney at Law
2 250 Montgomory St. St. 720

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Attorney at Law 250 Montgomery St, Ste 720 San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 397-4345

State Bar #107899

Attorney for Plaintiff

FILED

2006 MAY 31 PM 4: 04

Barbara Lase

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS

LIMITED CIVIL DIVISION

UNIFUND CCR PARTNERS ASSIGNEE OF CITIBANK,

No. 380735

Plaintiff,

COMPLAINT FOR MONEY

 $\Lambda$  .

JASON E DAVIS; DOES 1-10,

Demand: \$4,350.22

Defendants.

Plaintiff alleges as follows:

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- 1. Defendants presently reside in the county in which this matter is brought and this Court is the proper court for the trial of this matter.
- 2. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1-10 inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names and plaintiff will ask leave to amend this Complaint to set forth their true names and

COMPLAINT FOR MONEY - COMMON COUNTS

This case has been assigned to Judge Will

.22

capacities when the same are ascertained.

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on such information and belief, alleges that at all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was acting as the agent and/or servant of each of the other defendants and all actions alleged herein were within the course and scope of the defendant's agency and/or employment.
- 4. This cause of action is not subject to the provisions of Sections 1812.10 or 2984.4 of the Civil Code of the State of California.
- 5. Within the last four years defendants, and each of them, became indebted to plaintiff in the agreed sum of \$4,350.22 for goods and/or services rendered to defendants, and defendants then and there agreed to pay said amount to plaintiff.
- 6. No part of said sum has been paid, although demand therefor has been made, and there is now due, owing and unpaid the sum of \$4,350.22 together with interest thereon at the rate of 10% per annum from March 7, 2003.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 7. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the First Cause of Action.
- 8. Within the last four years defendants, and each of them, became indebted to plaintiff on a book account for a

balance due in the amount of \$4,350.22.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

- 9. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the First Cause of Action.
- 10. Within the last four years there was a written account stated by and between plaintiff and defendants, and each of them, whereby it was agreed that defendants were indebted to plaintiff in the sum of \$4,350.22.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- 1. For damages in the sum of \$4,350.22;
- 2. For interest in the sum of 7 percent per annum from and after March 7, 2003;
- 3. For other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

DATED: May 17, 2006

STEVEN A. BOOSKA Attorney for Plaintiff

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on tile in this office)

Clerk of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Stanislaus

Laura Altmand

Exhibit B

Ì 2

3

5

.7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

24

25

27

FILED-

06 JUL 10 AM 8:31

LILLE OF THE SHPERIOR COURT
OF STANISLAUS

WILL PERIOR
OF THE SHPERIOR COURT
OF STANISLAUS

OF STANISLAUS

OF STANISLAUS

Attorney for Defendant Jason Davis

Eric F. Fagan SBN #87071 2220 Otay Lakes Rd. #502-84

Chula Vista, CA 91915 Phone: (619) 656-6656

Fax: (775) 775-743-0307 efagan@efaganlaw.com

# SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF STANISLAUS

UNIFUND CCR PARTNERS ASSIGNEE OF

CITIBANK

Plaintiff,

vs.

JASON E. DAVIS; DOES 1-10, Defendants Case No.: 380735

**ANSWER** 

Defendant JASON E. DAVIS denies each and every allegation of Plaintiff's unverified complaint.

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's complaint and each count fail to state a cause of action against the defendant.

# SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claim is barred by Code of Civil Procedure §337.

# THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claim is barred by Code of Civil Procedure §339.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's complaint and each count are based on a contract that is an adhesion contract, and as such, portions of it are unenforceable.

# 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

28

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's complaint and each count are based on a contract that is illusory, and thus unenforceable.

#### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff has failed to state a count upon which to base an award of attorneys' fees.

# SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claim has been paid in full.

#### EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is in violation of the Rosenthal Act. .

# NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is in violation of U.S.C. 15 §1692 et seq.

#### TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff lacks standing to sue.

#### ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff lacks capacity to sue.

# Whereas defendant prays as follows:

- 1. That the plaintiff take nothing by its complaint,
- 2. For costs of suit,
- 3. For attorneys' fees, and
- 4. For other such relief as the Court may deem proper.

Dated: July 7, 2006

Eric F. Fagan,

Attorney for defendant Jason Davis

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Dorian Hudson, declare that:

I am, and was at the time of the service hereinafter mentioned, at least 18 years of age and not a party to this action. My business address is 2220 Otay Lakes Rd. #502-84 Chula Vista, CA 91915. I am employed in San Diego County, CA.

I served the following:

#### Answer

Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus Case No. 380735

On July 7, 2006 by depositing copies thereof in the United States mail at Chula Vista, CA 91911 enclosed in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to:

Steven A Booska 250 Montgomery St. Suite 720 San Francisco, CA 94104

Muddan

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed July 7, 2006 at Chula Vista, CA 91915.

Dorian Hudson

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office)

ATTEST: 4-23-07

Clerk of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Statistaus

Laura Altman